



# **SURVEY**

**of Aboriginal Adults residing outside the Northern  
Territory on**

**The Intervention and Stronger  
Futures Legislation, Constitutional  
Change and Treaties**

**'concerned Australians'**

**December 2013 to February 2014**

## Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank all those who took time and effort to complete the survey. We greatly appreciate your sharing your views with us.

We would like to thank a small number of non-Indigenous respondents to the survey. These did not match the criteria for the survey but a summary of responses is recorded in Appendix 1.

We would also like to thank those who assisted us in circulating the surveys.

## The Survey

This survey was conducted over a two month period with Aboriginal adults residing outside the Northern Territory.

The surveys contained twenty-three questions and sought the views of Aboriginal people on the Intervention in the Northern Territory, constitutional change and treaty (ies).

Survey forms were dispersed in a number of ways: directly to Aboriginal organisations, to individuals who were members of organisations and at public meetings.

In total sixty-five surveys were returned. Of these fifty-five met the stated criteria. While we had hoped for a higher number we recognised that the Christmas break had disrupted some follow-up and we also acknowledged that the survey itself was very demanding simply by its length.

Responses were received from twenty-three males with an age range of 32 years to 85 years and thirty-two females with an age range of 33 years to 80 years.

Of the surveys,

47% were received from New South Wales

36.5% were received from Victoria

5.5% were received from Queensland, and

3.5% were received from South Australia

7.5% no state details provided

There were no strong trends found throughout the survey that were related to age or gender. Nor was there any significant trend related to the state in which the surveys had originated.

Because the sample is small we do not intend to publish it but will provide access to it by placing it on the website. However, the findings are significant because of the consistency of the responses across the sample as a whole.

## Intervention and Stronger Futures Legislation

### Question 1: Can you remember when you first heard about the Intervention?

87% of respondents remembered when the Intervention was introduced

13% of respondents did not remember when the Intervention was introduced

### Question 2: What were your immediate reactions?

98% expressed opposition to the Intervention

Of these,

42% of respondents expressed very strong opposition to the Intervention in single word or phrase responses

20% of respondents described the Intervention as racist and a denial of human rights

13% of respondents saw the Intervention as Government taking control over Aboriginal people

13% of respondents expressed a belief that the policies will disadvantage Aboriginal peoples

5.5% of respondents commented that the Intervention had no connection to concerns about children, and

4% saw the Intervention as a means of Government getting control over Aboriginal land.

*“Appalled, frightened, disturbed, angry, saddened that our country’s government had regressed so far.”*

*“Assimilation and control, re-enactment of past government policies in a new coat.”*

*“I believed it was unconstitutional as well as abhorrent that a government would enact such a ploy in which to confuse the general*

*public (through miscommunication and deception) to take land from those Traditional Owners.”*

*“Outraged that the army was used to enter communities, causing fear and distress; outraged that only indigenous communities were being targeted; outraged that the Racial Discrimination Act was repealed in order for the Howard Government to be able to undertake its implementation.”*

**Question 3: Can you name any things about the Intervention that you like?**

70% of respondents could find nothing good about the Intervention

14% of respondents recognised the concerns about children and other social problems in the Northern Territory but expressed doubt that the Intervention would help

*“There is nothing I can support under the intervention. Anything that may have a ‘saving grace’ should be negotiated locally and reflect the needs and means of implementing they choose.”*

6% of respondents saw the need for an improvement of children’s care and education

*“ More children are being fed and going to school empowering women by giving greater control over household budgets.”*

4% of respondents saw the Intervention as a means to draw attention to the need to alleviate the socio-economic problems of the Northern Territory

*“The fact that the Government finally saw the need to help some of these communities and recognised the gravity of the issues – and that they were very long term. It has also raised the national consciousness about living conditions in these communities.”*

#### **Question 4: Can you name anything about the Intervention that you dislike?**

100% of respondents identified things that they disliked in the Intervention

40% focused on the removal of power from the people through

- leases , getting access to land
- basic cards to control money
- giving benefits to business and mining
- removal of community governance structures
- undermining of land rights
- divesting communities of their assets
- undermining human rights including the right to self-determination
- distilling community values built up over thousands of years
- denial of cultural autonomy and sovereignty
- surveillance
- loss of role models for the next generation
- taking away our voices

25% focused on the discriminatory nature of the Intervention

9% focused on the undermining of the Elders and cultural practices, while stereotyping individuals and communities, and divesting Aboriginal men of their dignity

6% focused on the lies behind the Intervention

*“Assimilation has a new name. It is Intervention.”*

*“ The whole intervention from its genesis to revelation of the abject failure to address the alleged social abuse of children. The deceit of Howard and Brough in creating an ‘emergency’ where none existed for the expressed aim of getting the Howard government re-elected, expressed by Alexander Downer after the election.”*

*“The services provided under the Intervention should have been afforded to these communities in the same way that they are available to every*

*other Australian. It did not require an Intervention. It required the government to do its job in service provision. ... The implication that Aboriginal people cannot control their own affairs, without any acknowledgement that have never been given 'no strings-attached' self-determination. That the failures in communities are in large part the fault of failed Government policies and processes."*

*"Totalitarianism, removal of freedom. Greedy for land for mining. No real hope or future for local Aboriginal people in the NT now – so much damage done from the Intervention. Another setback in terms of Aboriginal and government relations. The report was based on lies - there were hardly no or little incidence of child sexual abuse This was used as a mechanism to implement the Intervention."*

**Question 5: The Intervention is expected to continue under the name of Stronger Futures in the NT until 2022. What do you think of this?**

96% of respondents are opposed to continuing the Intervention under any name

*" Nothing has changed. Just recycled and renamed under a different guise to do what they did with our old people. Shameful."*

*"Hopefully the new Abbott government will review the whole travesty and have the moral courage to restore the rights of a group of Australian citizens, the victims in this case."*

**Question 6: Government is now asking NT communities to sign 99-year township leases in return for money. This will provide immediate cash but loss of control over land for ever. What do you think about this?**

98% of respondents disagree with signing 99-year leases

22% believe 99-year leases are a land grab by government for the purpose of mining.

*“Ownership [of land] for the white people is something on a piece of paper. You can no more sell our land than sell the sky. We have a different system. Our affinity with the land is like the bonding between a parent and a child. You have responsibilities and obligations to look after and care for a child. You can speak for a child. But you don’t own a child.” Paul Bherendt*

Several respondents ask why services that are provided to Australians across the country are not automatically provided to Aboriginal communities.

*“ Why should NT communities have to sign over control of their lands for basic services that the rest of Australian communities take for granted?”*

*“ Unacceptable – infrastructure should be provided as it would be in any other town or community, not be bribed by forcing communities to effectively sell land and lose control over culture.”*

Other respondents make the point that government should currently be renting land from Aboriginal people.

*“ It is the community land to start with. Government should be asked to pay some taxes.”*

*“...Indigenous people should not have to lease their own land. The onus should be on territory and federal to lease land from traditional custodians – pay the rent – land was never ceded.”*

*“ I think this is WRONG on so many levels and puts those poor people in a predicament that tempts them to sign away their LIFE. They have a CHOICE – our old people didn’t. It just breaks my heart to see what is happening up there. They must stay strong and know that they are our living ancestors and the closest thing we have to our old people.”*



**Question 7: Government will not provide housing to people living on Homelands. What do you think about this?**

100% of respondents were opposed to this policy describing it as unjust and biased against Aboriginal people

17% saw the policy as 'dispossession' by moving people from their lands and again some expressed their concern that the purpose behind the policy is related to mining.

*"Not supporting Aboriginal people to belong on their homelands is a national disgrace. It is well documented that people living on their homelands have better health conditions. Why deny people from the oldest living culture in the world that right? As the oldest continuing culture in the world, Aboriginal people should be venerated and afforded every right that ensures this continuance."*

*"Disgusting! They don't care about Aboriginal people. Like I say all the time, WE ARE AN OBSTACLE FOR THEM-SINCE DAY DOT! Terra Nullius helped them navigate around the atrocities they imposed upon our old people of the past and now this is just another expansion of that to force NT communities to sign their most valuable asset away-THEIR LAND! Housing is vital for Aboriginal communities and down this way in Victoria people (white and black) work here to help better living conditions of Aboriginal and TS Islander people, rather than make it worse! It also makes it easier for Government to mine their homelands if there are no dwellings on it... And makes it easier for communities to leave their homeland if they are not provided with housing. It's such a dastardly cunning plan on the Government behalf. Breaks my heart!!!"*

**Question 8: Do you think schools should be able to offer bilingual learning in classrooms of the NT?**

98% of respondents state that a child needs to have access to learning in their own language

2% of respondents indicate that a child can learn language in the home

*“Yes. It is common knowledge that to be able to live in this globalised world you need to understand a dominant language such as English. It is also common knowledge that language is the root of culture and that in order for culture to continue, language must be spoken. It is also common knowledge that bilingualism improves brain flexibility and plasticity. There is no reason why language cannot co-exist and bilingual Australians makes Australia a smarter, more adaptive, nation”*

*“Yes. I do not see why not. Language is important. Language and our culture is linked & important to us. Non-Aboriginal people throughout Australia should learn our languages and culture e.g. as they do in N.Z. Even non-Aboriginal people. My wife [non-Indigenous] is from N.Z. and she learnt Maori language in school”*

*“AND to learn your own language in your school-that you speak everyday and practice every day makes perfect sense. Once the language is gone- it’s GONE! My Grandfather would get the strap for speaking in language- but he’s gone now and it has too. I would give anything to learn it!”*

**Comment:**

From the survey responses to the question on Intervention and Stronger Futures legislation there appears to be two dominant core themes.

The first of these is the strong rejection of the Intervention and what it stands for. It also highlights the level of knowledge that exists outside the Northern Territory of the detail of the measures that have been imposed.

The second theme is the depth of distrust that Aboriginal people have of government policies and intentions. There is almost an expectation that episodes like the Intervention are part of government’s long-term agenda, and always have been. This is reflected in the numerous comments encapsulated in the “here we go again!”

## Constitutional Change

### Question 9: Do you think it is important to make changes to the Australian Constitution?

84% of respondents think it important to make changes

12% of respondents do not consider changes important

4% of respondents are uncertain

### Question 10: Why?

Changes to the Intervention are important because it should:

- provide a true history of this continent
- right the wrongs of the past
- empower people and allow for self-determination
- recognise sovereignty of the people
- recognise traditional owners
- recognise our rights
- recognise Aboriginal connection to the land and culture
- recognise that this is our land
- help work towards reconciliation
- provide us with reconciliation without which the constitution is blatantly racist
- provide us with equality

Although change is desired, there is scepticism regarding the benefits that may result:

- just a piece of paper; government tends to change the rules when it suits them
- the change will favour government and not the people
- will remain racist with or without changes to the constitution
- for 230 years laws have been made to control us – what difference will it make?

- Need to see treaties in place before constitutional change
- Must first establish treaties, establish land rights under international law

*“Some future government may wish to delete any changes so made. Any changes MUST be in the body of the constitution not in the preamble. The preamble is not part of the Constitution and can be altered on the whim, of any government.”*

*“The Constitution is the back bone of the Australian legal system which is also the illegal, colonial imperial authority whose jurisdiction on these lands known as Australia was only through invasion and today through ‘popular sovereignty’. Any progress for Indigenous peoples can be seen as positive however a mention on the preamble is an utter waste of time and the removal of the race powers (S51 ss26) is fraught with legal complexities. The proposed replacement of S51 ss26 with 51a removes the race power being applicable to any groups of peoples and replaces it with being applicable only to Indigenous peoples for their ‘advancement’ means that it will be up to the government to decide what is the ‘advancement’ of Indigenous peoples and the judiciary to interoperate. This is dangerous.”*

*“I consider this is a smokescreen which has little impact on the conditions indigenous people are facing, in the same way the 1967 Referendum was symbolic but has little effect in creating equitable conditions. Reconciliation is of a similar ilk-what does it mean on the ground, not much.”*

*“...the Aust Constitution was predominantly for the benefits of British born Australians whom were wanting to ensure that they could reinvent themselves in the colony with the social class systems of mother Britain, but for their benefits.”*

## Question 11: What changes would you like to see in the constitution?

18% of respondents would like to see treaty and sovereignty of Indigenous peoples acknowledged in the constitution

14% of respondents would like to see land rights secured in the constitution

10% of respondents would like to see true Aboriginal history acknowledged in the constitution

Other issues – in order of frequency:

- Aboriginal recognition
- removal of discriminatory sections of the constitution
- Recognition of traditional owners
- equality of health, housing and educational provisions
- acknowledgement of Aboriginal law, culture and spirituality
- political representation
- everything that is recommended by the Prime Minister's Expert Panel

*“The development of a ‘new’ Constitution needs to reflect the contemporary face of Australia. This incorporates Indigenous peoples, migrants, and colonial settle(r)s. A Constitution which acknowledges its entire history as espoused by former Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser would be an apt approach.”*

*“Identified seats in all houses of Parliament. Mainstreaming of services and budget streams has simply meant that Indigenous communities have become The Great Disappeared in their/our own country. When ATSIC was devolved and funds subsumed into a mainstream budget our communities lost out and the effect of this will be felt for decades. The decades expended fighting for self-determination and some form of autonomy were erased seemingly overnight.”*

*“Sovereignty first. There will be no will to change if Constitutional Reform goes through first.”*

**Question 12: Is there a conflict in attempting to make the constitution less racist while continuing the Intervention in the NT?**

87% of respondents state there is a conflict

7% of respondents do not perceive a conflict

4% of respondents are unsure whether there is a conflict

2% other

**Question 13: Why?**

52% of respondents state there is a conflict because the Intervention is racist and undermines human rights

Other concerns expressed include:

- failure to adequately consult people
- disempowerment of Aboriginal people
- Aboriginal people will still be treated as before
- The Intervention allowed illegal control over land that belonged to Aboriginal people
- Intervention measures should have been voluntary
- An amended constitution will conflict with parts of the Intervention
- We never hear both sides of any story

*“The intervention is disempowering, disrespectful and no other person in Australia is subject to such degradation and humiliation why is it okay to do this to Aboriginal people”*

*“Because the NT Intervention is racism at its most devious level... It’s like saying, “one hand doesn’t know what the other hand is doing”. If the Government appears to give a damn about the Constitution on the one hand, on the other hand it might make them achieve their goal of taking control of the NT communities land for financial gain. (Distraction is a vital part in the game of politics – but also hiding everything in plain sight – think about it?)”*

**Question 14: Will changing the constitution improve the lives of Aboriginal Peoples?**

36% of respondents state Aboriginal lives will be improved

36% of respondents state Aboriginal lives will not be improved

16% of respondents are unsure whether there will be improvements

9% of respondents state in some ways there will be improvement, in other ways there won’t be improvement

3% other

**Question 15: If YES, Why?**

- it will give us recognition
- symbolically it will remove the lines of separation
- it will make the Intervention unconstitutional
- Aboriginal people need to be sovereign in this land
- it will give us equal status
- our leaders could be in government
- we will gain greater autonomy
- it will be written that we were here first
- because constitution guides Australian law

- ATSI people will be undisputed equals wherever they live
- return to us control over our lives and our land
- it will ensure confidence and respect
- it will improve housing and language
- it will help us to better work together

Reservations about constitutional change are reflected in the following statements:

*“I don’t know we can only hope they would – I am reserved on this issue & very mistrustful of the Govt’s intentions.”*

*“We can only try if we have a say + are included in the discussion with it. We must be included + our voice heard.”*

*“I fear that the current attitudes are so deep-seated in society that it will take generations to actually improve the lives of Indigenous peoples.”*

*“Not the ones [the changes] proposed.”*

*“It should but that alone will not be enough.”*

*“It may but get to have politicians who are willing to make it improve.”*

#### **Question 16: If NO, Why?**

*“It will appear to non Aboriginal people that ‘things are OK’ when they are really not.”*

*“Doubtful – Governments will not change the hearts of the people.”*

*“At a practical level, nothing will change.”*

*“Issues are much deeper than words on a bit of paper – write it on the land.”*

*“Nothing will change for the people on the lands.”*

*“Because the powers that be do not honour their words.”*



*“Because the constitution is not for improving our situation. It is a cover for stealing our sovereignty.”*

*“Unless Aboriginal people can see real improvement and understand that it is a guaranteed inclusion, the changes will only be another token gesture.”*

*“The proposed changes are oriented towards assimilation.”*

*“Because they will still interpret it through their own eyes. Like ‘67 Referendum for the benefit of ATSI but we still have ‘Intervention’.”*

*“without a strong ability to be self determining, our societies will remain fraught.”*

*“Its whiteman’s whitewash!”*

**Comment:**

It is clear from the survey that there is strong support for constitutional reform. However it is also clear that there is very little knowledge of the proposals for change that are currently under discussion. The gap between these and the broad range of issues that have been canvassed in this survey for inclusion in a new constitution is very great and cause for concern.

## Treaty (ies)

**Question 17: Where would you most like to see government placing its energies if you had to choose?**

**(a) on creating constitutional change? Or**

**(b) on moving towards treaty(ies)**

59.5% of respondents prefer energy to be spent on moving toward treaty(ies)

24% of respondents prefer energy to be spent on creating constitutional change

11% of respondents indicate energy should be spent on both

5.5% other

**Question 18: Why?**

Treaties are important because they:

- are our right
- will give us self-determination
- recognise our sovereignty which was never ceded
- could bring genuine change
- nothing can move forward without treaties
- will return control over our lives
- will enable unification in the present and recognition of the past
- enable a better world for future generations
- would build more sustainable communities
- would give real rights

Constitution is important because it:

- is law
- holds weight with other Australians
- constitution may be more valid in the high court
- is written for everyone to see and includes new Australians
- it is more achievable
- would bring us into the mainstream of Australian life

Both constitution and Treaty are necessary now because:

- you can't have one without the other
- both are appropriate
- changes that empower treaty should be in the constitution
- one works with the other

Concerns expressed include:

- constitutional reform means assimilation
- treaty has many hidden agendas
- we are divided and conquered already

**Question 19: Is a treaty important to you personally and/or to your nation?**

83% of respondents indicated the treaty was important

15% of respondents indicated that it was not important

2% of respondents indicated that it was doubtful

**Question 20: Why?**

- to right the wrongs of the past
- show a spirit of good faith to do what is right by ATSI people
- a step forwards to reconciliation
- we would have the ability to negotiate with dignity and as equals
- it will lead to empowerment and self-determination, self-governance and self-reliability
- because we are sick of white-washing lies and the constant shifting of rules and boundaries
- it will recognise the value of Aboriginal people
- we would be in control of our destiny and future
- my ancestors never ceded

*"The land needs it, people deserve it, history needs to be acknowledged."*

*“The recognition, a treaty will filter through to every other constitution and government policy.”*

*“Helps me retain my spiritual belief + customs in a non-threatening way.”*

*“Because it shows that the Australian Government and UK (monarch)- would have the right intentions to work in the spirit of good faith to do what’s right by ATSI people and try to right the wrongs of the past. It would be a step towards reconciliation and valuing the importance of ATSI people, land and culture. We need to look after this country of ours – not destroy it!”*

*“Treaties are recognised in International Law and carry obligations that have consequences and those breaches can be heard by the International Court of Justice. We have nowhere to go now with any complaint.”*

Questions were asked and concerns expressed:

*“Who’s gonna sign it? The life of a treaty?”*

*“Treaties, as seen in other colonial countries are too easily broken.”*

*“Meaningless words produced by incompetent government and lawyers with agendas”*

**Question 21. What are the most important things you would like to see negotiated in treaty (ies)?**

- land rights
- water rights
- hunting and fishing rights
- control over land use
- sovereignty rights
- seats in federal and state parliaments
- rights to self-determination
- recognition of cultural structures
- compensation for land taken
- self-governance in homelands
- protection of language and culture

*“Indigenous Knowledge systems front and centre in relation to negotiations. No more self-appointed Indigenous and/or non-indigenous experts; no more government appointed Indigenous Advisory Councils purporting to represent all communities – this is not Indigenous way of being and doing. Stop attempting to force Indigenous sovereign peoples into Westminster system without fair and equitable representation.”*

*“Access to land, resources, cultural practices, places of significance  
Benefit sharing, right to negotiate on natural resource extraction whether native title is recognised or not.”*

*“Homelands inviolate for communities. That communities are allowed self-determination in the real sense. An absolute right to carry consequences of self governance without interference from governments that react on lack of evidence of improvement every election.”*

*“Recognition, equality, and responsibility to care for the country, water and people. Something has to help Native Title which has divided and destroyed communities – we need the promise and hope of a new future.”*

*“This should be left to the Elders of my nation, but it should include recognition and respect of all our people past and present.”*

## **Question 22: Would treaty(ies) make a big difference to Aboriginal peoples?**

77.5% of respondents state treaty(ies) would make a difference

15% of respondents state treaty(ies) would not make a difference

7.5% of respondents state that treaty(ies) would possibly make a difference

## **Question 23: If YES, in what way?**

- would give us legal rights to control our own affairs on our own land
- entrench rights to access and benefit from lands and resources
- allow us to determine our own priorities

- would return authority in society – which has been stripped away
- take a greater role in the future of the country
- would allow for pre-colonisation history to be valued
- would give us a voice whereby we would be valued and respected
- would give us back our identity
- would give Indigenous peoples self-determination, respect and power
- Indigenous peoples would be clear about their rights and hopefully have the power to litigate against contraventions

*“It will help to heal by seeing publicly that its [dependence] over.”*

*“Reversal of current power structure, but so much damage has been done to communities in such a short time-frame that inequity will take generations to rectify if ever – see colonized countries across the globe. Those who have suffered under colonization are then blamed for not righting wrongs inflicted upon them by others. Resources stripped by a select few, while those who suffer poverty, and every other negative statistic, see the chasm between the haves and have nots ever-widening.”*

*“Any recognition at that level would benefit ATSI people. It has to be better than where we are now?”*

**Comment:**

Support for treaties is particularly strong. The survey highlights the yearning of Aboriginal people to rectify the injustices of the past and to right the history that has never been told. Treaties are seen as a route by which self – determination can be activated, the relationship between land and Aboriginal people will be acknowledged and culture will be valued and respected. Expectations of treaty are again very high.

## APPENDIX 1

As mentioned at the beginning of the report, a small number of surveys were not included in the sample because they had been completed by non-Indigenous respondents. A summary of findings of those particular surveys is below. There are considerable parallels between these findings and those of the main survey.

### Intervention:

1. 88% remembered the implementation of the Intervention and strongly opposed it
2. The Intervention was seen as disempowering and hurtful and as a further attempt to take back land and advantage the mining industry
3. It was seen as a lost opportunity to work with Aboriginal people, as well as being racist and arrogant
4. There was no support for Stronger Futures legislation. Nor was there any support for 99-year leases or a policy that failed to provide housing to Homelands.
5. There was strong support for bilingual learning. Language is culture

*“I have a masters in ESL and it is proven that if literacy is at a high level in first language, it is easier to bring the standard up in a second.”*

*“I think staying connected to language is incredibly important for kids in the NT. Learning their language from Elders in their communities who can teach them, is so vital to understanding their culture as a whole.”*

### Constitutional Change:

1. 88% of respondents support constitutional change
2. It is seen as a way of including Aboriginal people and changing what is considered as a currently racist document

3. However, it is seen as valid only if Aboriginal people have their say
4. Opposition to constitutional change is also noted:

*“ Will constitution fix any of the urgent issues? In my opinion they will not. If anything it could enable hardship, as government will have special powers to create laws ‘for the benefit of Indigenous Australians.’ Right, just like forcibly removing children ‘for their benefit’ and culture was for ‘their benefit’. I smell a rat. A big one.”*

5. Changes that are hoped for by constitutional change:
  - a. enhancing land rights, culture and language
  - b. a treaty with our Aboriginal people
  - c. recognition of sovereignty
  - d. the right of communities to have an impact on policies
  - e. a complete overhaul of the system
  - f. indigenous peoples managing their own affairs on their own land
  - g. adequate funding for Aboriginal people to run their own health centres, legal centres and schools
  - h. it is for Aboriginal people to say what is in the constitutional changes
6. All respondents identified conflict in removing racism from the constitution while the Intervention continues under the name of Stronger Futures. It is seen as a double-standard as the Intervention is racist and disempowering.
7. There was a divided response to whether changes to the constitution would improve the lives of Aboriginal people – *“only time will tell!”*
8. Further responses:

*“The changes will only distract from the real issue – send false messages to Australians so that in the end Australians will think that everything is OK now.”*

*“I really hope so but I doubt the integrity of government.”*



## Treaty (ies)

1. There is strong support for treaties. There is also strong support for treaties as a part of constitutional change. However there is also concern:

*“ Only since the marketing machine that is the Recognise campaign started, do we hear some people wanting Constitutional recognition: does anyone other than the Government’s hand-picked Expert Panel on Constitutional Recognition know what any of the proposals actually mean and how they will effect everyday people?”*

*...It is about giving the communities the tools to make an informed decision on their own. I don’t think this has happened. The discussion has been incredibly one sided.”*

2. All respondents thought treaty important to them because: Treaty (ies) is what Aboriginal people want.

*“Yes, if it gives autonomy to all nations and recognises the different needs of all nations”*

3. The most important things to be negotiated in treat (ies) are seen as:
  - a. land right
  - b. self-determination
  - c. secure Homeland
  - d. bilingual learning

*“ I want what the Indigenous community wants. It is not about me, it is about them.”*

4. Treaty (ies) would make a difference because they would:
  - a. have legislative backing
  - b. secure land rights
  - c. help the healing process

However, comment was noted that treaty (ies) would make a difference but, *“only if designed by Elders in every Nation.”*